



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,035	06/04/2004	Arvind Prabhakar	03226/493002; SUN040039	4145
32615	7590	08/13/2008		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER MAI, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com
DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM
hathaway@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/618,035	Applicant(s) PRABHAKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner KEVIN S. MAI	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed July 7, 2008.
2. Claims 1-30 have been canceled. Claims 31-48 have been added. Claims 31-48 have been examined and are pending.

Specification

3. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn in view of the amendments made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 43-48 recite 'computer readable medium comprising executable instructions'; however computer readable medium was never disclosed in the specification. As such these amendments appear to be adding new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 31-36 appear to only be claiming software and as such are seen to be claiming non statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 31-33, 36-39, 42-45 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 5892919 to Nielsen (hereinafter “Nielsen”).
10. **As to Claim 31, Nielsen discloses a system for translating domain names comprising:**
a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) detection module, configured to:
receive a URL request by a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache

Art Unit: 2152

(500). As such it is seen that because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check cache, that it must have received the issued URL), **and**

determine that the URL request is an invalid URL request (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check cache. If it is not found the GET command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed (500,505));

a URL redirection module, configured to:

receive the invalid URL request from the URL detection module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL

(515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further seen that that component must have received the invalid URL request as well), **and**

redirect the invalid URL request to a FQDN translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL

(515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module); **and**

the FQDN translation module, configured to:

translate the invalid URL request to a target valid FQDN using a FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and

Art Unit: 2152

then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL).

11. **As to Claim 32**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31, **further comprising:**

a FQDN default setter configured to provide a default target valid FQDN, wherein the FQDN default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if the invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user with the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target valid FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available).

12. **As to Claim 33**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31, **wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN** (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5 discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

13. **As to Claim 36**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31, **wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN translation module execute in a browser** (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column

2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all associated modules are executing within the browser).

14. **As to Claim 37, Nielsen discloses a method for translating domain names, comprising:**

receiving, by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) detection module, a URL request from a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen

discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache (500). As such it is seen that because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check cache, that it must have received the issued URL), **and**

determining, by the URL detection module that the URL request is an invalid URL request (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check cache. If it is not found the GET command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed (500,505));

receiving, by a URL redirection module, the invalid URL request from the URL detection module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another

Art Unit: 2152

component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further seen that that component must have received the invalid URL request as well);

redirecting, by the URL redirection module, the invalid URL request to a FQDN

translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module);

translating, by the FQDN translation module, the invalid URL request to a target valid

FQDN using a FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL); **and**

directing the user to a web site associated with the target valid FQDN (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL, which was then issued).

15. **As to Claim 38**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37,

further comprising:

providing a default target valid FQDN by a FQDN default setter, wherein the FQDN

default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if the

invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user with

Art Unit: 2152

the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target valid FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available).

16. **As to Claim 39**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37, **wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN** (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5 discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

17. **As to Claim 42**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37, **wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN translation module execute in a browser** (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column 2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all associated modules are executing within the browser).

18. **As to Claim 43**, Nielsen discloses **a computer readable medium comprising executable instructions for translating domain names by:**

Art Unit: 2152

receiving, by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) detection module, a URL request from a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen

discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache (500). As such it is seen that

because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check cache, that it must have received the issued URL), **and**

determining, by the URL detection module that the URL request is an invalid URL request

(Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check

cache. If it is not found the GET command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed

(500,505));

receiving, by a URL redirection module, the invalid URL request from the URL detection

module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the

associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since

the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another

component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further

seen that that component must have received the invalid URL request as well;

redirecting, by the URL redirection module, the invalid URL request to a FQDN

translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping

module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen

that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module);

translating, by the FQDN translation module, the invalid URL request to a target valid FQDN using a FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL); **and directing the user to a web site associated with the target valid FQDN** (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL, which was then issued).

19. **As to Claim 44**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43, **further comprising:**

providing a default target valid FQDN by a FQDN default setter, wherein the FQDN default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if the invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user with the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target valid FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available).

20. **As to Claim 45**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43, **wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN** (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5

Art Unit: 2152

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

21. **As to Claim 48**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43, **wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN translation module execute in a browser** (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column 2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all associated modules are executing within the browser).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2152

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

24. Claims 34, 35, 40, 41, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and further in view of US Pat. 6151624 to Teare et al. (hereinafter "Teare").

25. **As to Claim 34**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31. Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.**

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Nielsen, with having the URL request comprise an alias and having the alias be stored in the mapping module disclosed by Teare. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because it is desirable to have a way to access information available over the Web using a natural language word or "real" name associated with the information (column 4 lines 4-6 of Teare).

26. **As to Claim 35**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 34, **wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias to the target**

valid FQDN (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

27. **As to Claim 40**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.**

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

28. **As to Claim 41**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 40, **wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias to the target valid FQDN** (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

29. **As to Claim 46**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.**

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

30. **As to Claim 47**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 46, **wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias URL request to the target valid FQDN** (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

Conclusion

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2152

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN S. MAI whose telephone number is (571)270-5001. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KSM

**/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152**